

Supreme Court of Misconsin

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

110 E. Main Street, Suite 215 P.O. Box 1688

MADISON, WISCONSIN 53701-1688

Telephone (608) 266-1880 TTY Users: Call WI TRS at 1-800-947-3529; request (608) 266-1880 Fax (608) 267-0640 Web Site: www.wicourts.gov A. John Voelker
Director of State Courts
and
Acting Clerk of Supreme Court

WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT MONTHLY STATISTICAL REPORT

MAY 2011

This statistical report presents information about the case filings and dispositions of the Wisconsin Supreme Court during the month of May 2011 and to date for the term that began on September 1, 2010.

Opinions Issued by the Court

The Supreme Court issued opinions resolving 10 cases in May. Information about these opinions, including the Court's dispositions and the names of the authoring justices, can be found on the attached table.

\underline{M}_{S}	ay 2011	Term to Date
Total number of cases resolved by opinion	<u>10</u>	<u>48</u>
Attorney disciplinary cases		19
Judicial disciplinary cases	0	0
Civil cases	7	21
Criminal cases	2	8

Petitions for Review

A total of 54 petitions for review were filed during the month. A petition for review asks the Supreme Court to review the decision of the Court of Appeals. The Supreme Court's jurisdiction is discretionary, meaning that review is granted in selected cases only. In May, the Supreme Court disposed of 79 petitions for review, of which 4 petitions were granted. The Supreme Court currently has 179 petitions for review pending.

<u>N</u>	<u>May 2011</u>	Term to Date
Petitions for Review filed	<u>54</u>	<u>592</u>
Civil cases	24	295
Criminal cases	30	297

Petition for Review dispositions	<u>79</u>	608
Civil cases (petitions granted)	39 (2)	323 (41)
Criminal cases (petitions granted)	40 (2)	285 (20)

Petitions for Bypass

In May, the Supreme Court received no petitions for bypass and disposed of no petitions for bypass. In a petition for bypass, a party requests that the Supreme Court take jurisdiction of an appeal or other proceeding pending in the Court of Appeals. A matter appropriate for bypass is usually one which meets one or more of the criteria for review by the Supreme Court and one the Supreme Court concludes it will ultimately choose to consider regardless of how the Court of Appeals might decide the issues. A petition for bypass may also be granted where there is a clear need to hasten the ultimate appellate decision. The Supreme Court currently has no petitions for bypass pending.

	May 2011	Term to Date
Petitions for Bypass filed		<u>7</u> 5
Criminal cases	0	2
Petition for Bypass dispositions	 -	<u>11</u>
Civil cases (petitions granted)	0 (0)	7 (0)
Criminal cases (petitions granted)	0 (0)	4 (1)

Requests for Certification

During May 2011, the Supreme Court received 2 requests for certification and disposed of 1 request for certification. In a request for certification, the Court of Appeals asks the Supreme Court to exercise its appellate jurisdiction before the Court of Appeals hears the matter. A request for certification is decided on the basis of the same criteria as a petition to bypass. The Supreme Court currently has 4 requests for certification pending.

	May 2011	Term to Date
Requests for Certification filed	1	8 6 2
Request for Certification dispositions	$\overline{1}$ (1)	6/4 (3) 2 (2)

Regulatory Matters, Supervisory Writs, and Original Actions

During the month, 8 matters within the regulatory jurisdiction of the Court (bar admission, lawyer discipline, and judicial discipline) were filed and no cases (disciplinary) were reopened. The Supreme Court also received 6 petitions for supervisory writ, which ask the Supreme Court to order the Court of Appeals or a circuit court to take a certain action in a case. No original actions were filed. An original action is a petition asking the Supreme Court to take jurisdiction over a particular matter. When an opinion is issued in these cases, the disposition is included in "Opinions Issued by the Court" above; otherwise, the case is disposed of by order and is included in the totals below. The Supreme Court currently has 43 regulatory matters and 12 writs pending.

<u>Ma</u>	ay 2011	Term to Date
<u>Filings</u>		
Attorney discipline (including reopened cases)	8	64
Judicial discipline	0	0
Bar admission	0	0
Petitions for Supervisory Writ (other writs)	6	47
Other (including Original Actions)	0	2
Dispositions by Order		
Attorney discipline	1	8
Judicial discipline	0	0
Bar admission	0	1
Petitions for Supervisory Writ (other writs)	11	47
Other (including Original Actions)	0	8

DECISIONS BY THE WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT

OPINIONS ISSUED DURING MAY 2011

ATTORNEY DISCIPLINE CASES

Docket No.	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
2007AP1281-D	Office of Lawyer Regulation (OLR) v. Michael F. Hupy Public Reprimand. Per Curiam ¹ Gableman, J. did not participate. <u>Dissent</u> : Roggensack, J. joined by Ziegler, J.	05/27/2011

CIVIL AND CRIMINAL CASES

Docket No.	<u>Title</u>	Date
2009AP0806-CR	State v. Marvin L. Beauchamp Affirmed. <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Crooks, J. <u>Concurrence</u> : Abrahamson, C.J.	05/03/2011
2009AP1252-CR	State v. Shantell T. Harbor Affirmed. <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Bradley, J.	05/10/2011
2009AP0956-CR	State v. Donovan M. Burris Reversed and remanded to the Court of Appeals. <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Crooks, J. <u>Concurrence</u> : Prosser, J. <u>Dissent</u> : Abrahamson, C. J.	05/17/2011
2009AP2973	In re the termination of parental rights to Gwenevere T., a person under the age of 18: Tammy W-G. v. Jacob T. Affirmed. <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Roggensack, J. <u>Dissent</u> : Abrahamson, C. J. <u>Dissent</u> : Bradley, J., joined by Abrahamson, C. J.	05/17/2011

¹ "Per Curiam" means "by the Court." Opinions issued *per curiam* are handed down by the Court as a whole.

2009AP1714	Emjay Investment Company v. Village of Germantown Affirmed. <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Ziegler, J.	05/17/2011
2008AP1139	State v. Omer Ninham Affirmed. <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Ziegler, J. <u>Dissent</u> : Abrahamson, C. J., joined by Bradley, J.	05/20/2011
2009AP0688	Susan Foley-Ciccantelli and Dr. Mark J. Ciccantelli v. Bishop's Grove Condominium Association, Inc. and State Farm Fire & Casualty Company Order of the circuit court reversed and cause remanded. Majority Opinion: Abrahamson, C. J. Concurrence: Prosser, J. Concurrence: Roggensack, J., joined by Ziegler, J. and Gableman, J.	05/24/2011
2009AP1669	Roger H. Fischer, Sr. and Sandra J. Fischer v. Pamela A. Steffen and Wilson Mutual Insurance Co., Kohler Company and Medicare Secondary Payer Recovery Contractor Affirmed. Majority Opinion: Abrahamson, C. J. Dissent: Bradley, J. Dissent: Prosser, J.	05/24/2011
2009AP1422	Jessica L. Siebert, by her Guardian ad Litem, D. J. Weis and Lynette A. Siebert, Steve Albrecht, Jr., by his Guardian ad Litem, Thomas W. Kyle, Steven Albrecht, Sr., Kari Sosnowski, by her Guardian ad Litem, Thomas W. Kyle and Cyndi Anderson, Oneida County Department of Social Services v. Wisconsin American Mutual Insurance Company, Interstate Brands Corporation, ACE American Insurance Company and Ryan Friberg Reversed. Majority Opinion: Ziegler, J. Dissent: Crooks, J., joined by Abrahamson, C. J. and Bradley, J.	05/24/2011

2009AP2784 Mark Klemm and Jeanne Klemm v. American

Transmission Company, LLC

Reversed.

Majority Opinion: Abrahamson, C. J.

05/26/2011